

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION EIGHT

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

DARRETT LOCKETT,

Defendant and Appellant.

B206858

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. GA068925)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County.
Leslie E. Brown, Judge. Affirmed.

John D. O'Loughlin, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant
and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

As Deanna Brown left a Pasadena pharmacy about 5:00 p.m. on November 14, 2005, she was mugged by three young black men, one of whom grabbed her purse and punched her in the face. Brown said Lockett was one of several young men who had been standing in front of a nearby restaurant. Two days later, Brown was shown a photo line-up and positively identified Darren DeWayne Lockett as the one who grabbed her purse and hit her. Lockett was charged with robbery (Pen. Code, § 211), along with an allegation that he committed the crime for the benefit of a criminal street gang (Pen. Code, § 186.22).

At trial, Brown identified Lockett as her attacker, and testified that she also identified him from a live line-up conducted almost two years after the incident. A Pasadena police gang officer testified that Lockett and an accomplice also identified by Brown were members of the Pasadena Denver Lane Blood (PDL) gang. It was stipulated that PDL qualified as a criminal street gang under section 186.22. According to the gang expert, the area where the crime occurred was a known PDL hang-out. The police gang expert testified that if a woman were mugged and had her purse taken by two PDL gang members in front of a PDL hangout, the crime was most likely committed in association with a criminal street gang for the benefit of the gang. The jury convicted Lockett of robbery and found the gang allegation was true. A combined state prison sentence of 13 years was imposed.

Lockett filed a notice of appeal and we appointed counsel to represent him. On July 30, 2008, after examining the record, counsel filed an opening brief in which no issues were raised. The brief included a declaration stating that counsel had informed Lockett of his right to file a supplemental brief. On that same day, we advised Lockett of his counsel's inability to find any arguable issues and told Lockett he had 30 days to submit by brief or letter any contentions he wished this court to consider. He did not file a supplemental brief.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that appellant's attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

RUBIN, ACTING P. J.

WE CONCUR:

FLIER, J.

BIGELOW, J.